

Crafton Hills College Budget Committee Agenda

Date: September 18, 2018
Time: 1:00 p.m. – 2:30 p.m.
Location: CCR 247

Members (Absent*):

Mike Strong (Chair)
 Rebecca Warren-Marlatt
 Keith Wurtz
 Tina Marie Gimple

Stephen Ramirez
 Daniel Sullivan
 Kathy Crow
 Ralph Rabago

Brandi Mello
 Jose Murguia (student)*
 Kirsten Colvey*
 Kevin Palkki (CSEA)*

TOPIC	DISCUSSION	FURTHER ACTION
<p>Discussion of potential RAM guidelines to recommend to DBC</p>	<p>Recommended RAM Goals Address direct costs Accountability=increases in costs etc. for the district office and growth at the district. Based on ACCJC standard III.D.1 based on the Student Centered Funding formula. Keith: The goal is to support students, programs and services. Dollars are attached to metrix that reflect legislative mandates in the state funding formula. Methodology: Process Revenues: ie., Perkins-should be disaggregated by college. 70/30 split is not equitable for us (Keith). Reporting is not the same at both colleges. Kirsten, the intent behind restricted funds is not being honored. Equitable outcomes? ie., infrastructure is different and Crafton had to fund some of that and Valley didn't. Keith, we could use the state's approach and disaggregate by college and not reinvent a new process. May help promote a fixed-cost model. Mike, we need simulations to gage impacts. Allocation: RAM is broken down. Language is similar to what we use now. Distribution: We could insert shared costs. Be cautious about what we are asking for here. Solar Farm, Non-potable shared across the district. Ralph: No benefit for saving in a fixed cost model.</p>	

Fixed Costs list:
 SB361 Status quo.
 Funding for improvement based on the metric from the state.
 District funding should be allocated as

- a. 18% district funding (everything but the colleges). State funding increases, district gets more funding at 18%. Doesn't speak to colleges priorities for funding. Districts establish different percentages.
- b. What percentage did we have last year? Our percentages decreased. District's increased. There should be a standard for reorgs. for the district. Negotiated increases in pay needs to be addressed before allocating funding to the entities. If anything changes it needs to be vetted, reviewed each year to decide effectiveness.

Possibly based on percentages with an annual review and meeting the needs of the district. Look at percentage model, base it on "real" needs and prioritize.

Other ideas: How to deliver the changes to the RAM. Jose suggested a RAM task force to discuss the revisions to the RAM. The task force will be attended by all interested and we can present our ideas for changes to the task force to hash it out.

PPR Prioritization Categories Discussion

PPR committee is looking at different ways to prioritize. Looking for input from this committee. ie., group faculty needs separate from say classified

The budget committee recommends that the priority is done efficiently,

	hires etc. Currently chairs are doing this, it's not moving from the list forwarded. Objectives by college, rolls up to prioritization. Chairs council is looking at need that already exists. Should the direction be a process to categorize the priorities? No category exists that should come before any other. Consensus: The current priority list is working the way it is. The process is solid, but there hasn't been funding to accommodate needs.	we just have not had funding for them.
Closing Next Meeting: 10/16/18 @ 1:00-2:30pm, CCR 247		